Appl. No. 10/734,550
Amdt. dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-24 were pending. In this amendment, claims 1, 11, 15, 19 and 21 are amended, no claims are added and no claims are deleted. Therefore, claims 1-24 remain pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 10-16 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0120639 to Basin et al. (hereinafter "Basin"), rejected claims 7, 17 and 19-24 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Basin and U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0240065 to Lovvik et al. (hereinafter "Lovvik") and rejected claims 8-9 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Basin, Lovvik and U.S. Patent No. 6,722,338 to Hull et al. (hereinafter "Hull").

Applicants aver that no new matter has been entered with this Amendment.

35 USC §102/§103 Rejections and Cited References Differentiated

Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Basin, with the Examiner asserting that Basin teaches each element of claim 1, referring to paragraphs 35-37, 39, and Figures 4, 9 *et seq.* of Basin. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claim 1 and the following arguments.

Claim 1, as amended, is allowable as the Basin reference (and the other cited references) fail to disclose or suggest each element of amended claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites "replacing references to the first level content files in the content package file with the content extracted from the first level content files to create a combined file" and "creating a preview of at least a portion of the content package file based on the content in the combined file, wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the content package file." Applicant submits that at least these claimed elements are missing from the teachings of the cited references.

While Basin may teach the review of file lists, extraction of selected files from an archive file and opening an extracted file in a viewer, those steps do not necessarily include the

replacement of references with content or the creation of a preview having content extracted from the first level content files, nor does Basin appear to suggest such operations.

The Examiner cited to paragraph 39 and Fig. 9 of Basin as teaching extracting content and replacing references with content, but that paragraph does not appear to disclose or suggest any uses of content. A listing of files and icons might be construed to be references to files, but those do not include content of the files.

The Examiner cited to paragraph 35-36 and Fig. 9 of Basin at teaching creating a preview, but those cites do not appear to disclose the claimed preview. At most, it teaches the presentation of a list of files and allows the user to open a package and view a listing of the files therein. Claim 1, as amended, recites creating a preview wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files, but does not appear to be disclosed or suggested by Basin.

The other cited references do not make up for the lack in Basin. Lovvik was cited for the proposition that it was known to import files to a server and a portal server. Hull is cited for the proposition that it was known to overwrite duplicative files. Applicant submits that Lovvik and Hull, even if they could be properly combined with Basin, would not provide a combination that would include all of the elements of claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1, allowable over the cited references.

Claim 11

Claim 11 was rejected as being anticipated by Basin, with the Examiner asserting similar arguments as against claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claim 11 and the following arguments.

Claim 11, as amended, is allowable as the Basin reference (and the other cited references) fail to disclose or suggest each element of amended claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites "code for generating a content package file based on the content in the combined file, wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from

Appl. No. 10/734,550
Amdt. dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

PATENT

the first level content files and content from the content package file." Applicant submits that at least that claimed element is missing from the teachings of the cited references.

While Basin may teach the review of file lists, extraction of selected files from an archive file and opening an extracted file in a viewer, Basin appears to fail to disclose or suggest the claimed code for generating creating a preview wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files.

The other cited references do not make up for the lack in Basin, as least for the reasons stated above with reference to claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, claim 11 is allowable over the cited references and claims 12-18, which depend from claim 11, allowable over the cited references.

Claim 19

Claim 19 was rejected as being unpatentable over Basin in view of Lovvik, with the Examiner asserting similar arguments as against claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claim 19 and the following arguments.

Claim 19, as amended, is allowable as the Basin reference (and the other cited references) fail to disclose or suggest each element of amended claim 19. For example, claim 19 recites "a client that displays the preview screen, wherein information rendered by the preview screen displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the content package file." Applicant submits that at least that claimed element is missing from the teachings of the cited references as none of them describe a client that could display a preview screen that is the claimed preview screen.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 19 is allowable over the cited references and claims 20-24, which depend from claim 19, allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/734,550
Amdt. dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Bart Sullivan
Reg. No. 41,516

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200 Fax: 415-576-0300
CBS:rgy
60536611 v2